

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANDREW FULLMAN,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff,	:	NO. 17-2673
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,	:	
et al.,	:	
Defendants.	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this **2nd** day of **July, 2018**, upon consideration of Plaintiff's Request for a New Judge to be Assigned to Case (ECF No. 31) it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's request (ECF No. 31) is **DENIED**.¹

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

¹ Plaintiff's request for a new judge is solely based on the fact that the Court previously stayed discovery pending resolution of Defendants' motion to dismiss. See ECF No. 19. However, "judicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion." Deputy v. Williams, 318 F. App'x 133, 137 (3d Cir. 2009) (citing Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994)); see also United States v. Bertoli, 40 F.3d 1384, 1412 (3d Cir. 1994) ("[B]ias, in order to form the basis for recusal, must stem from a source outside of the official proceedings.") (quoting Liteky, 510 U.S. 545). Here, Plaintiff has stated no extrajudicial source of bias.